



RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED EXAMINATION
EXAMINING GROUP 2627
Docket No.: 1293.1839

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Dong-ryeol LEE et al.

Serial No. 10/617,855

Group Art Unit: 2627

Confirmation No. 3801

Filed: July 14, 2003

Examiner: Tawfik A. GOMA

For: OPTICAL PICKUP AND OPTICAL RECORDING AND/OR REPRODUCING
APPARATUS USING THE SAME

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FINALITY AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

MAIL STOP: AFTER FINAL

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed January 24, 2008, and having a period for response set to expire on April 24, 2008. A petition for a one-month extension of time is concurrently filed herewith, there by extending the response due date to May 24, 2008.

In the Advisory Action issued April 21, 2008, the Examiner maintained that the diffraction grating of Park performed the claimed convergence or divergence. "The examiner contends that the use of the collimating lenses to further adjust convergence or divergence of light does not in any way preclude the use of the diffraction grating of Park for a similar function. The diffraction grating of Park is clearly disclosed to be capable of adjusting the location of 0 and +-1 order light onto the proper location of the photo-detector...Furthermore, the act of diffraction of light essentially contains the process of adjusting convergence and/or divergence of light since it changes the direction of the light that is incident upon the grating, and Park discloses that the element's property of changing the direction of the waves is used to converge light onto specific locations on the photo-detecting elements."